

From: [PETERSON Jenn L](#)
To: [Joe Goulet/R10/USEPA/US@EPA](#); [Eric Blischke/R10/USEPA/US@EPA](#); [Burt Shephard/R10/USEPA/US@EPA](#)
Cc: [Jeremy Buck@fws.gov](#)
Subject: RE: ATC approach
Date: 05/27/2008 10:58 AM

The "tree diagram", or decision criteria, is really one thing that should be worked out better before the BERA. For example, they should be using the 95% UCL on the mean for sediment exposure (over appropriate home range) and not the 95th percentile as mentioned in the figure, and I agree with Joe that we should have some idea what they are proposing for "realistic preferences". There were several details that were left out of the problem formulation that I thought we were going to work with them on as they were developed. Is that going to happen, or will the first time we can comment on their proposal be in the BERA? Also, we haven't even seen how they are proposing to do the fish ATCs and associated decision criteria.

-Jennifer

-----Original Message-----

From: Goulet.Joe@epamail.epa.gov [mailto:Goulet.Joe@epamail.epa.gov]
Sent: Tuesday, May 27, 2008 8:30 AM
To: Blischke.Eric@epamail.epa.gov; Shephard.Burt@epamail.epa.gov
Cc: Jeremy_Buck@fws.gov; PETERSON Jenn L
Subject: Fw: ATC approach

Eric and Burt,

I have reviewed the LWG's ATC approach and I agree with it. It was helpful to review the presentation again.

The next step with LWG is to agree on the "realistic preferences" and the "additional analysis" as described in the last box of the decision tree.

"Realistic dietary and foraging preferences of the receptor (prey?|fraction?|weighted HQs based on home?|range > 1.0) indicate potential HQ exceedances. Perform additional analysis and evaluation as appropriate for a baseline risk assessment."

Joe

----- Forwarded by Joe Goulet/R10/USEPA/US on 05/27/2008 08:19 AM -----

Eric Blischke/R10/USE PA/US		To
05/22/2008 08:17 AM	Joe Goulet/R10/USEPA/US@EPA	cc
	Fw: ATC approach	Subject

Here it is

----- Forwarded by Eric Blischke/R10/USEPA/US on 05/22/2008 08:17 AM -----

"John Toll" <johnt@windwardenv.com>		To
05/21/2008 02:49 PM	Eric Blischke/R10/USEPA/US@EPA	cc
	<Jim.McKenna@portofportland.com>, "Wyatt, Robert" <rjw@nwnatural.com>, "Keith Pine" <kpine@anchorenv.com>, "Valerie Oster" <voster@anchorenv.com>, "Lisa Saban" <lisas@windwardenv.com>, "Nancy A. Musgrove" <nancym@windwardenv.com>, "Matt Luxon" <mattl@windwardenv.com>, "Suzanne Replinger" <suzanner@windwardenv.com>	Subject
	ATC approach	

Hi Eric,

Per agreements at the May 14 LWG-EPA "wrap up" meeting and the May 15 managers' meeting, attached please find the written example of using backward risk calculations in the Portland Harbor BERA. This is a hypothetical example, provided for illustrative purposes only. The numbers presented do not represent actual Portland Harbor values.

It's our understanding that with this example provided, the "ATC approach" issue is resolved. Please let us know whether you concur.

Thanks in advance,

John

John Toll, Ph.D.
Partner
Windward Environmental LLC
200 West Mercer Street, Suite 401
Seattle, WA 98119-3958
(206) 812-5433
(206) 913-3292 (cell)
www.windwardenv.com

The information contained in this e-mail message is intended only for the personal and confidential use of the recipient named above. This message may be an attorney-client communication and as such is privileged and confidential. If the reader of this message is not the recipient named above or an agent responsible for delivering it to the intended recipient, the reader is hereby notified that this message has been received in error and that any review, dissemination, copying or distribution of this message is strictly prohibited. If you have received this message in error, please notify the sender immediately, and delete this message. (See attached file: ATC example.pdf)